UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,937	01/29/2002	Yutaka Iyoki	P21953	3791

7055 7590 08/03/2006

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
SERRAO, RANODHI N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/057,937	IYOKI, YUTAKA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ranodhi Serrao	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2. The applicant argued in substance the newly added limitations of independent claims 15, 20, and 21 and the newly added claims 23-34. However, the new grounds teach these and the added features. See rejections below.

3. The applicant also argued that the obviousness of the combinations of the references are not supported by any evidence of motivation that flows from the disclosures of the documents themselves. This is however incorrect since the motivations to combine the cited references are stated within the references themselves. See below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 15, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomat (6,459,499) and Leung et al. (5,877,963).

6. As per claim 15, Tomat teaches a terminal apparatus configured to receive image data from a scanner, the terminal apparatus comprising: an interface configured to be connected to the scanner via a network (see Tomat, col. 6, line 52-col. 7, line 5); a memory configured to store information indicating a plurality of file types (see Tomat,

col. 10, lines 25-34) and an application program associated with each of the plurality of the file types, each application program being configured to open a document file associated with at least one of the plurality of the file types (see Tomat, col. 14, lines 13-34); and a controller configured to: receive, from the scanner, a control file including a file name (see Tomat, col. 8, lines 20-28); receive, from the scanner, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner (see Tomat, col. 4, lines 6-10); analyze the file name included in the received control file to obtain the file type of the received document file (see Tomat, col. 14, lines 13-34). But fails to teach search the memory to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory; and start the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon the application program determined in the search. However, Leung et al. teaches search the memory to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory; and start the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon the application program determined in the search (see Leung et al., col. 10, lines 30-46: wherein it is inherent that the processor 8 searches the memory in order to find the related application program). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat to search the memory to determine the application program associated with the obtained file type from the application programs stored in the memory; and start the application program associated with the obtained file type to open the received document file based upon

the application program determined in the search in order to provide a method of automatic recognition and filing of documents of a repeating nature (see Leung et al., col. 2, lines 13-17).

7. As per claims 23 and 26, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 15 applies fully in order to combine Tomat and Leung et al.

8. As per claim 23, Tomat and Leung et al. teach a terminal apparatus, the controller being further configured to determine whether data received from the scanner comprises a control file and a document file, and when the controller determines that the received data includes the control file and the document file, to search the memory (see Leung et al., col. 10, lines 30-46).

9. As per claim 26, Tomat and Leung et al. teach a terminal apparatus, the controller being configured to determine which application program to start, based upon data stored in memory, without user input (see Leung et al., col. 10, lines 30-46).

10. Claims 16-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomat and Leung et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Shima (2002/0004802).

11. As per claim 16, Tomat and Leung et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach a terminal apparatus, wherein the controller receives, from the scanner, the control file and the document file, according to a Lpr/Lpd protocol. However Shima teaches a terminal apparatus, wherein the controller receives, from the scanner, the control file and the document file, according to a Lpr/Lpd protocol (see

Shima, ¶ 167). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat and Leung et al. to a terminal apparatus, wherein the controller receives, from the scanner, the control file and the document file, according to a Lpr/Lpd protocol in order to print a file using this specific protocol (see Shima, ¶ 167).

12. As per claim 17, Tomat and Leung et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach a terminal apparatus, wherein the controller displays the image data included in the document file on a display of the terminal apparatus, in the form of thumbnail. However, Shima teaches a terminal apparatus, wherein the controller displays the image data included in the document file on a display of the terminal apparatus, in the form of thumbnail (see Shima, ¶ 169). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat and Leung et al. to a terminal apparatus, wherein the controller displays the image data included in the document file on a display of the terminal apparatus, in the form of thumbnail in order to indicate a prediction result (prescan) before the formal image read is executed (see Shima, ¶ 130).

13. As per claim 18, Tomat and Leung et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach a terminal apparatus, wherein the memory stores a plurality of display states associated with the information indicating the plurality of the file types, and the controller displays the image data included in the document file on a display of the terminal apparatus, based on the display state associated with the obtained file type. However, Shima teaches a terminal apparatus, wherein the memory stores a

plurality of display states associated with the information indicating the plurality of the file types, and the controller displays the image data included in the document file on a display of the terminal apparatus, based on the display state associated with the obtained file type (see Shima, ¶ 130-131). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat and Leung et al. to a terminal apparatus, wherein the memory stores a plurality of display states associated with the information indicating the plurality of the file types, and the controller displays the image data included in the document file on a display of the terminal apparatus, based on the display state associated with the obtained file type in order to give an operation instruction to another image information input-output unit (see Shima, ¶ 134).

14. As per claim 19, Tomat, Leung et al., and Shima teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but Tomat and Leung et al. fail to teach a terminal apparatus, wherein the display state comprises displaying the image data in the form of a thumbnail. However, Shima teaches a terminal apparatus, wherein the display state comprises displaying the image data in the form of a thumbnail (see Shima, ¶ 169). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat and Leung et al. to a terminal apparatus, wherein the display state comprises displaying the image data in the form of a thumbnail in order to indicate a prediction result (prescan) before the formal image read is executed (see Shima, ¶ 130).

15. As per claim 22, Tomat and Leung et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach a terminal apparatus, wherein the interface is configured to be connectable to each of a plurality of scanners via a network, and the controller is

configured to receive, from one of the plurality of the scanners, a control file including a file name and to receive, from the one of the plurality of the scanners, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner. However, Shima teaches a terminal apparatus, wherein the interface is configured to be connectable to each of a plurality of scanners via a network (see Shima, ¶ 24), and the controller is configured to receive, from one of the plurality of the scanners, a control file including a file name and to receive, from the one of the plurality of the scanners, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner (see Shima, ¶ 131). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat and Leung et al. to a terminal apparatus, wherein the interface is configured to be connectable to each of a plurality of scanners via a network, and the controller is configured to receive, from one of the plurality of the scanners, a control file including a file name and to receive, from the one of the plurality of the scanners, a document file, the document file including image data scanned by the scanner in order to allow a user who uses retrieval information to specify control information and thus simply entering predetermined retrieval information registered in various units for performing various types of image information processing (see Shima, ¶ 24).

16. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomat (6,459,499) and Leung et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Tomat (6,784,925).

17. As per claim 24, Tomat '499 and Leung et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach a terminal apparatus, wherein the memory stores file extensions with associated application programs and associated display states, the control file received from the scanner including a file extension. However, Tomat '925 teaches a terminal apparatus, wherein the memory stores file extensions with associated application programs and associated display states, the control file received from the scanner including a file extension (see Tomat '925, col. 16, line 62-col. 17, line 5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat '499 and Leung et al. to a terminal apparatus, wherein the memory stores file extensions with associated application programs and associated display states, the control file received from the scanner including a file extension in order to integrate a digital camera as a system object into windowing applications for viewing system objects, such as Explorer or My Computer.RTM., and to provide visual feedback and drag and drop functionality with respect to all data files stored in the camera (see Tomat '925, col. 1, line 56-col. 2, line 6).

18. As per claim 25, Tomat '499 and Leung et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 15 above but fail to teach a terminal apparatus, the controller being configured to utilize the file extensions to search the memory for the associated application program. However, Tomat '925 teaches a terminal apparatus, the controller being configured to utilize the file extensions to search the memory for the associated application program (see Tomat '925, col. 21, lines 54-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tomat '499 and Leung et al.

to a terminal apparatus, the controller being configured to utilize the file extensions to search the memory for the associated application program in order to integrate a digital camera as a system object into windowing applications for viewing system objects, such as Explorer or My Computer.RTM., and to provide visual feedback and drag and drop functionality with respect to all data files stored in the camera (see Tomat '925, col. 1, line 56-col. 2, line 6).

19. Claims 20, 21, and 27-34 have similar limitations as to claims 15-19 and 22-26, therefore, they are being rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER